

Appl. No. 09/935,782  
Amdt. Dated June 10, 2004  
Reply to Office action of Feb. 12, 2004

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed on February 12, 2004 ("Office Action"). Claims 1-13 were rejected. In this Amendment, claims 1-13 have been amended and claims 24-28 have been added. Claims 1-13 and 24-28 are pending in the application. The Abstract has been amended.

#### **Objection to Abstract**

The Examiner objected to the Abstract. The Abstract has been amended to add additional detail with respect to an embodiment of the invention. Review and approval of the amended Abstract are respectfully requested.

#### **Objection to Claims 7 and 12**

Claims 7 and 12 were objected to as being duplicates of each other. Claim 12 has been amended, inter alia, to depend from claim 9, instead of claim 4. Thus, claim 12 is different from claim 7. Therefore, it is believed that the objection to claims 7 and 12 has been overcome. Review and approval are respectfully requested.

#### **Rejection of Claims 1-13 under 35 USC § 112, First Paragraph**

Claims 1, 4 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. The Office Action indicated that the language of such claims was not clear and concise and that one skilled in the art would not know how to use the claimed invention. Claims 2-3, 5-8 and 10-13 were rejected for being dependent from rejected base claims.

The Office Action refers to particular language in the claims for this rejection. Such language has been amended. It is therefore believed that the rejection is not applicable and has been overcome. Review and approval are respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 09/935,782  
Amdt. Dated June 10, 2004  
Reply to Office action of Feb. 12, 2004

**Rejection of Claims 1-13 under 35 USC § 101**

Claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Applicants do not agree with the Office Action's application of 35 USC §101 to the claimed subject matter. Additionally, the amended claims are clearly in the technological arts, and the original basis for the Office Action's rejection is no longer present. It is therefore believed that the rejection under 35 USC §101 has been overcome.

**Rejection of Claims 1-13 under 35 USC § 102(e)**

Claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. Pub. No. US 2001/0049675 (Mandler). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Claim 1 (as amended) includes:

1. A method of searching resources on the web, comprising:
  - receiving a search query to search for information on the web;
  - accessing one or more web pages and one or more subsets of one or more web pages, the subsets having been extracted from the one or more web pages prior to receiving the search query, the subsets extracted responsive to one or more views, the one or more views defined independently of the search query, wherein the views are content-sensitive filters that specify which sub-parts of a web page a user is interested in;
  - prior to receiving the search query, storing the subsets in a database;
  - responsive to the search query, identifying at least one of one or more of the extracted subsets of one or more web pages stored in the database, the search query used as a criterion for identifying at least one of the one or more subsets.

It is believed that such combination of elements is not taught or suggested by Mandler. For example, the use of views as content-sensitive filters in a method as described in claim 1 is not taught or suggested by Mandler. Accordingly, it is believed that claim 1 is patentable over the reference Mandler.

Claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1 and are also believed patentable for at least the reasons as to claim 1. These claims are also believed independently patentable. For example, the references fail to teach or suggest of views wherein the views are capable of identifying desired portions of the

Appl. No. 09/935,782  
Amdt. Dated June 10, 2004  
Reply to Office action of Feb. 12, 2004

web pages when the respective web pages evolve. Allowance of such claims is therefore also respectfully requested.

Claim 4 is also believed patentable over the cited references. The cited references fail to teach the use of views as claimed in claim 4, with respect to electronic documents.

Claims 5-8 depend from claim 4 and are believed patentable for at least the reasons as to claim 4. These claims are also believed independently patentable.

Review and approval of claim 9 and its dependent claims are also respectfully requested.

**New claims.**

New claims 24-28 have been added. It is believed that such claims are patentable over the cited references and review and approval of such claims are respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 09/935,782  
Amdt. Dated June 10, 2004  
Reply to Office action of Feb. 12, 2004

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, including petition fees and extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 23-2415 (Docket No. 25961.708).

Respectfully submitted,

WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI

Date: June 10, 2004

  
George A. Willman, Reg. No. 41,378

650 Page Mill Road  
Palo Alto, CA 94304  
(650) 493-9300  
Customer No. 021971

Appl. No. : 09/935,782 Confirmation No. 9031  
Applicant : Jaswinder P. Singh et al.  
Filed : August 22, 2001  
TC/A.U. : 2171  
Examiner : Merilyn P. Nguyen  
Docket No. : 25961.708  
Customer No. : 21971

Simultaneously herewith an Information Disclosure Statement is being filed via Express mail to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. As a courtesy to the Examiner, PTO/SB/08A (10-01), (substitute for form 1449A/PTO), is being submitted herewith.